

DAVID L. MILLIGAN, Esq., #192184
LAW OFFICES OF DAVID L. MILLIGAN, APC
1265, West Shaw Avenue, Suite 100
Fresno, CA - 93720
Telephone: (559) 439-7500
Fax: (559) 439-7550
Attorney for Plaintiff: Larry Giraldes, Jr.

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SACRAMENTO DIVISION

LARRY GIRALDES, JR.,)	2-01-cv-2110 LKK EFB P
)	
)	PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST AND ORDER
Plaintiff,)	TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER
v.)	
)	Date: December 14, 2012
T. PREBULA, et al.,)	Judge Lawrence K. Karlton
Defendants.)	

MOTION TO MODIFY SCHEDULE ORDER

I.

MODIFICATION OF SCHEDULE ORDER

"Orders entered before the final pretrial conference may be modified upon a showing of
"good cause." FRCP 16(b). "A *schedule* may be modified only for *good cause* and with the
judge's consent." FRCP 16(b)(4). The court may modify the schedule order if it cannot

1 reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension. *Johnson v. Mammoth*
2 *Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992.) “The district court is given broad
3 discretion in supervising the pretrial phase of litigation, and its decisions regarding the preclusive
4 effect of a pretrial order ... will not be disturbed unless they evidence a clear abuse of discretion.”
5 *Zivkovic v. Southern California Edison Co.*, 302 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002.)

6 Plaintiff is represented by *pro bono* counsel. Plaintiff's medical expert must be
7 approved by the court before Plaintiff's *pro bono* counsel can be guaranteed reimbursement for
8 the expert expenses. Counsel has been diligent in seeking a medical expert in this case, however,
9 medical experts have been unable to agree to trial testimony because of the distant trial date of
10 October 8, 2013. Plaintiff has recently obtained a medical expert who has agreed to trial
11 testimony. Plaintiff has submitted the appropriate forms to obtain approval of the expert,
12 however since at the time they were filed for pre-approval, the Complaint had been dismissed
13 without prejudice (Order 11:16-18 ECF No. 209). Plaintiff subsequently timely filed his Second
14 Amended Complaint, however there is now another Motion to Dismiss Second Amended
15 Complaint pending before this Court to be heard December 17, 2012. Today, December 14,
16 2012 is the Date for parties to file and serve their Designation of Expert Witness. For the
17 foregoing reasons, Plaintiff is unable to comply with this order at this time.

18 Plaintiff intends and proposes the following. If the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss
19 Second Amended Complaint is denied, Plaintiff intends to re-file his application for approval of
20 expert witness fees. Then, if approved, the retained medical expert will be paid and begin work.
21 His work will likely consist of reviewing the file, and preparing his report concerning his
22 opinions. At that time Plaintiff will be in a position to meaningfully comply with the
23

Designation of Expert Witnesses obligation. Although it is uncertain how long it will take for Plaintiff's medical expert to complete his work to and including report completion, I would imagine it could take 60 days. Therefore, that is our request.

There will be no prejudice from the sought extension. On the evening of December 13, 2012 Plaintiff's counsel emailed counsel for the Defense advising we will be seeking this order, and requesting their stipulation. As of this writing and filing, we have received no reply.

Plaintiff seeks this extension to comply with the pre-trial requirements of Federal procedure.

The case has been active for over 10 years and there are no surprises. New law and technicalities have lengthened the life of the case, but this extension will not prejudice or extend the trial date which is set for October 8th, 2012.

II.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff respectfully requests the court to extend the deadline, under the court's discretion, for closure of discovery to allow Plaintiff to designate his experts within the ordered time.

Dated: December 14, 2012

Respectfully submitted,


LAW OFFICES OF DAVID L. MILLIGAN

/s/David L. Milligan

By: _____
David L. Milligan, Esq.,
Attorney for Plaintiff,
Larry Giraldes, Jr.

1 GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, it is so ORDERED that the current Scheduling Order and
2 all pending deadlines are VACATED. Further status to be set upon the disposition of the
3 pending motion, if necessary.

4
5 Dated: December 14, 2012.

6
7 
8 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
9 SENIOR JUDGE
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24